

6 month reporting date 11/24/04 X
 12 month reporting date 05/24/05 x
 18 month reporting date 12/24/05 Received 11/16/05

Rapid City School District Improvement/Progress Report Form

Principle: 1 – General Supervision				
<p>Present levels: (Statement of present levels of performance that resulted in area of non-compliance) 24:05:24:01. Referral Referral includes any written request which brings a student to the attention of a school district administrator (building principal, superintendent, or special education director) as a student who may be in need of special education. A referral made by a parent may be submitted verbally, but it must be documented by a district administrator.</p> <p>Through interview and a review of student records, the monitoring team could not locate a documented referral for 26 students initially evaluated. Special education staff interviewed was not aware of a referral document used by the district. A document used by district psychologists included “referral” in its title. This form however was not used as a referral which brings a student to the attention of a school district administrator (building principal, superintendent, or special education director) as a student who may be in need of special education.</p>				
<p>Desired Outcome(s): Through systemic change, the district/agency will achieve these results for students with disabilities and their families.</p> <p>The district ensures all referrals are documented, including those received verbally from parents.</p>				
<p>Measurable Goal: The district/agency determines what goals are appropriate given the areas of difficulty. There must be a direct relationship between the goal(s) and the needs identified in the present levels. (Multiple goals may be identified for each principle. Please complete a new sheet for each goal.)</p> <p>For all students referred for an evaluation in RCAS, there will be a completed referral form within each student’s special education file, detailing all areas of concern for the student.</p>				
Short Term Objectives: Include the specific measurable results that will be accomplished and the criteria that will be used to measure the results.	Timeline for Completion	Person(s) Responsible	6 month progress Record date objective is met	12 month progress Record date objective is met
1. What will the district do to improve? The district psychologists will be completing the referral form each time a new student is entered in Skyward. What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective? 20% of student files that are initial evaluations will be checked for completed referral forms in Skyward. The total number of files checked and the number which contain completed referral forms will be reported to SEP.	Ongoing	Review team comprised of: Judy Osburn, Todd Christensen, one psychologist, and one specialist	Met January 05	

6 month reporting date 11/24/04 X
 12 month reporting date 05/24/05 x
 18 month reporting date 12/24/05 Received 11/16/05

Please explain the data (6 month) There were 59 initial evaluations conducted so far this year in RCAS. Of those 59, 12 files were checked (20%) in Skyward. Of the 12 checked <u>12</u> student files in Skyward contained completed referral forms (100%).				
2. What will the district do to improve? The completed referral form will be printed out from Skyward to be placed in each student's special education file. What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective? 20% of student files that are initial evaluations will be checked for completed referral forms in the special education file. The total number of files checked and the number which contain completed referral forms will be reported to SEP.	Ongoing	Review team comprised of: Judy Osburn, Todd Christensen, one psychologist, and one specialist	Met January 05	
Please explain the data (6 month) The secretary of psychology services now sends the completed referral form to the case managers with the consent. There were 59 initial evaluations conducted so far this year in RCAS. Of those 59, 12 files were checked (20%) at their building. Of the 12 checked, <u>11</u> files had completed referral forms in the special education file. (91.6%)				

Principle: 1 – General Supervision

<p>Present levels: (Statement of present levels of performance that resulted in area of non-compliance) <u>24:05:18:03. Procedures for identification of misclassified children.</u> Each public agency must maintain specific documentation as to the identification, evaluation, program, and placement of each child with disabilities. <u>24:05:18:05. Program reviews.</u> The division shall conduct program administrative reviews to determine whether students have been classified according to this article. If, as a result of these reviews, the division determines that Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Part B funds have been made available to an eligible public agency as the result of a misclassified child, the division shall begin recovery procedures.</p> <p>The monitoring team was unable to validate an IEP was in effect on December 3rd, 2002 for 55 students who were listed on the district's 2002 child count. Through interview, district staff indicated students were placed on the child count list as a result of a computer programming error.</p>
<p>Desired Outcome(s): Through systemic change, the district/agency will achieve these results for students with disabilities and their families.</p> <p>The district has an established procedure for collecting, maintaining and reporting current and accurate data on all child identification activities.</p>

6 month reporting date 11/24/04 X
 12 month reporting date 05/24/05 x
 18 month reporting date 12/24/05 Received 11/16/05

Measurable Goal: The district/agency determines what goals are appropriate given the areas of difficulty. There must be a direct relationship between the goal(s) and the needs identified in the present levels. (Multiple goals may be identified for each principle. Please complete a new sheet for each goal.)				
All student reported on child count will have an IEP in effect on December 1 st of the reporting year.				
Short Term Objectives: Include the specific measurable results that will be accomplished and the criteria that will be used to measure the results.	Timeline for Completion	Person(s) Responsible	6 month progress Record date objective is met	12 month progress Record date objective is met
<p>1. What will the district do to improve? Weekly reminders will be given to special education staff at pre-referral to complete child count updates in the State Report tab in Skyward after each IEP meeting or dismissal.</p> <p>What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective? Each case manager will complete quarterly caseload checks from Skyward and sign to verify the accuracy of his/her count. The verified and signed caseload counts will be sent to the director. Verification of these activities will be sent to SEP.</p>	Ongoing	District psychologists	Met January 05	
<p>Please explain the data (6 month)</p> <p>RCAS psychologists remind school staff to update the “state report” tab in Skyward each time an IEP is written and/or revised with an addendum. Program specialists also remind staff at each monthly meeting to update this information. Caseload verifications were completed by each case manager at the beginning of the school year, and are also being completed at this time. An additional reminder to complete caseload verifications was included in the specialist newsletter sent on 11/16/04. Of the 126 case managers in RCAS, <u>106</u> completed caseload verifications in Skyward as of this reporting date. Data from Skyward is directly imported into SIMS for the December 1st child count.</p>				
<p>2. What will the district do to improve? Quarterly reminders will be sent to all special education staff in the specialist newsletter to keep their caseloads updated.</p> <p>What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective? Each case manager will complete quarterly caseload checks from Skyward and sign to verify the accuracy of his/her count. The verified and signed caseload counts will be sent to the director. Verification of these activities will be sent to SEP.</p>	Ongoing	Program Specialists	Met January 05	

6 month reporting date 11/24/04 X
 12 month reporting date 05/24/05 x
 18 month reporting date 12/24/05 Received 11/16/05

Please explain the data (6 month) A reminder to complete caseload verifications was included in the specialist newsletter sent on 11/16/04. Of the 126 case managers, <u>106</u> have completed verifications of child count/case load.				
3. What will the district do to improve? Prior to when the December 1 st , child count is submitted to SEP, the child count list will be verified at each attendance center to ensure an IEP is in effect on December 1 st for each student on the count. What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective? The specialists will send verification that the onsite child count is accurate to the director. This data will then be forwarded on to SEP.	November 30 th of each year	Program specialists	Met January 05	
Please explain the data (6 month) Caseload verifications were completed by each case manager are being completed at this time. An additional reminder to complete caseload verifications was included in the specialist newsletter sent on 11/16/04. Of the 126 case managers in RCAS, <u>106</u> completed caseload verifications in Skyward. Data from Skyward is directly imported into SIMS for the December 1st child count.				

Principle: 3 – Appropriate Evaluation
<p>Present levels: (Statement of present levels of performance that resulted in area of non-compliance)</p> <p><u>Issues requiring immediate attention</u></p> <p><u>24:05:25:04. Evaluation procedures.</u></p> <p>The school districts shall ensure the child is assessed in all areas related to the suspected disability, including, as applicable, health, vision, hearing, social and emotional status, general intelligence, academic performance, communicative status, and motor abilities.</p> <p><u>24:05:24:01:01. Students with disabilities defined.</u></p> <p>Students with disabilities are students evaluated in accordance with chapter 24:05:25 as having autism, deaf-blindness, deafness, hearing impairment, mental retardation, multiple disabilities, orthopedic impairment, other health impairments, emotional disturbance, specific learning disabilities, speech or language impairments, traumatic brain injury, or visual impairments including blindness, which adversely affects educational performance, and who, because of those disabilities, need special education or special education and related services.</p> <p><u>24:05:22:03. Certified child.</u></p> <p>A certified child is a child in need of special education or special education and related services who has received a multidisciplinary evaluation and has an individual education program formulated and approved by a local placement committee. Documentation supporting a child's disabling condition as defined by Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act must be maintained by the school district for verification of its annual federal child count.</p>

6 month reporting date 11/24/04 X
 12 month reporting date 05/24/05 x
 18 month reporting date 12/24/05 Received 11/16/05

<p>The review team identified the following issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A multidisciplinary team evaluation did not yield eligibility scores for a student so the team initiated an override in the areas of reading, writing and math. The students program did not contain a goal in reading, writing, math or any other academic area. 2. The standard error of measurement was used to determine a student eligible for special education under the category of learning disabled. 3. The MDAT data for another student does not support the disability category of emotionally disturbed. Behavior indicators do not indicate clinically significant issues. The existing data would support a possible learning disability. 4. An MDAT report for another student states they are eligible as a student with multiple disabilities (mental retardation-510 and speech/language-550), however, the student was dismissed from speech services at the MDAT meeting. A district evaluation list provided to the monitoring teams indicates this student was placed on the 2003 child count as a student with autism (560). Social and behavior evaluation data was not available to support this as disability category. 5. Evaluation data for four students, categorized as students with other health impairments, did not identify how the disability impacts education or the need for an individual education program. Behavior scores contained no clinically significant indicators and/or the students programs contained no educational services. <p>Specific information regarding each of these students has been provided to the Director of Special Services. Each student's IEP team must meet and resolve the issues identified.</p>				
<p>Desired Outcome(s): Through systemic change, the district/agency will achieve these results for students with disabilities and their families.</p> <p>The district ensures comprehensive evaluations are administered and considered by the IEP team when determining whether the child has a particular category of disability.</p>				
<p>Measurable Goal: The district/agency determines what goals are appropriate given the areas of difficulty. There must be a direct relationship between the goal(s) and the needs identified in the present levels. (Multiple goals may be identified for each principle. Please complete a new sheet for each goal.)</p> <p>All students identified as having a particular disability under IDEA will receive a comprehensive evaluation that supports and documents that (A) the student has that particular disability, and (B) due to that disability, suffers an adverse effect on educational performance, so that the student requires special education services to benefit from his or her education.</p>				
<p>Short Term Objectives: Include the specific measurable results that will be accomplished and the criteria that will be used to measure the results.</p>	<p>Timeline for Completion</p>	<p>Person(s) Responsible</p>	<p>6 month progress Record date objective is met</p>	<p>12 month progress Record date objective is met</p>

6 month reporting date 11/24/04 X
 12 month reporting date 05/24/05 x
 18 month reporting date 12/24/05 Received 11/16/05

1. What will the district do to improve? The issues stated above that required immediate attention were addressed by conducting evaluations as needed, as well as reconvening the IEP teams to make any appropriate IEP revisions. What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective? All documentation of the "immediate fixes" was sent to team leader on May 11, 2004.	Immediate fixes	Case managers and school psychologists	Met January 05	
Please explain the data (6 month) All documentation of the "immediate fixes" was sent to team leader on May 11, 2004.				
2. What will the district do to improve? A discussion group (comprised of the advisory council) will be held monthly to discuss the components of good evaluations based upon each disability, with first focus being that of Other Health Impaired. What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective? The meeting dates and persons attending each of these meetings will be submitted to the SEP.	Ongoing	Special education advisory group	Met January 05	
Please explain the data (6 month) The following meetings were held to address this issue. May 3, 2004—Advisory council meeting including all psychologists, program specialists, case workers, Todd Christensen and Judy Osburn, May 17, 2004—RCAS Psychologist retreat—including all nine psychologists June 1, 2004—RCAS Psychologist meeting—including all nine psychologists August 19, 2004—RCAS Psychologist meeting—including all nine psychologists November 15, 2004—RCAS Psychologist meeting—including all nine psychologists—specifically discussion on the OHI category An analysis of OHI category within the RCAS is included with this submission.				

6 month reporting date 11/24/04 X
 12 month reporting date 05/24/05 x
 18 month reporting date 12/24/05 Received 11/16/05

<p>3. What will the district do to improve? The director will receive lists of new evaluations and/or reevaluations that are being conducted in the district. A select team from the special education advisory group will randomly review 20% of all students initially evaluated or reevaluated in RCAS to ensure that the students received an evaluation that is comprehensive enough to fully support the identified disabling condition, as well as assist in educational programming for the student.</p> <p>What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective? The total number of evaluations reviewed by disability category, and the results of the reviews will be reported to SEP.</p>	Ongoing	Review team will consist of Judy Osburn, Todd Christensen, one psychologist, and one program specialist	Met January 05	
<p>Please explain the data (6 month) There were 59 students initially evaluated in RCAS so far this fall. Of that 59, <u>12</u> student files were reviewed, and <u>10</u> student files contained evaluations that are comprehensive enough to fully support the identified disabling condition, as well as assist in educational programming for the student. (83%) There were 156 students reevaluated in RCAS so far this fall. Of that 156, <u>31</u> student files were reviewed, and <u>27</u> student files contained evaluations that are comprehensive enough to fully support the identified disabling condition, as well as assist in educational programming for the student. (87%)</p>				
<p>4. What will the district do to improve? A list of other options available to teachers for students with behavior/non-compliance issues (non-completion of school tasks), rather than an IEP, will be generated by the advisory group to give to parents, special educators, and general classroom teachers.</p> <p>What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective? The completed technical assistance/guidance document will be sent to SEP.</p>	December 2004	Special education advisory panel		Met May 25, 2005
<p>Please explain the data (6 month) This has not occurred yet, but is in the planning stage with a committee from the advisory group.</p>				
<p>Please explain the data (12 month) Staff in the district completed a compilation of strategies for non-producers and a copy of this book is enclosed.</p>				

6 month reporting date 11/24/04 X
 12 month reporting date 05/24/05 x
 18 month reporting date 12/24/05 Received 11/16/05

<p>5. What will the district do to improve? A separate “area override” form will be designed for IEP teams to differentiate between a true eligibility override according to ARSD 24:05:24.01:31, and an “area override” whereby a student has a documented disability in one academic area, but the IEP team feels there is enough evaluation evidence, and/or functional assessment to serve the student in other academic areas.</p> <p>What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective? The form to document an “area override” will be sent to SEP.</p>	December 2004	Special education advisory panel		Met May 25, 2005
<p>Please explain the data (6 month) As of this date, no separate “area override” form has been completed. The RCAS psychologists, however, have been instructed to write on each override completed, an “A” for area override, or a “D” for disability override. This has been occurring since August, 2004. Since August of 2004, there have been 59 initial evaluations and 159 reevaluations. Of the total number of evaluations (218), 13 overrides were completed. Of the overrides completed, 7 were disability overrides, and 6 were area overrides ” whereby a student has a documented disability in one academic area, but the IEP team felt there was enough evaluation evidence, and/or functional assessment to serve the student in other academic areas.</p>				
<p>Please explain the data (12 month) The RCAS psychologists now include the override language and information, whether it is for a disability override or “area” override, on the completed MDAT form. An example of both kinds of override has been enclosed.</p>				

Principle: 3 – Appropriate Evaluation

Present levels: (Statement of present levels of performance that resulted in areas of non-compliance)

24:05:25:04. Evaluation procedures.

The school district shall ensure a variety of assessment tools and strategies are used to gather relevant functional and development information about the child, including information provided by the parents that may assist in determining whether the child is a child with a disability and content of the child's IEP.

24:05:27:01.03. Content of individualized education program.

A student's IEP must contain present levels of performance based upon the specific skill areas affected by the student's disability. The present levels of performance are based upon the functional assessment information gathered during the comprehensive evaluation process. Present levels of performance must contain the student's strength, needs, effect of the disability on the student's involvement/progress in the general curriculum and parent input.

6 month reporting date 11/24/04 X
 12 month reporting date 05/24/05 x
 18 month reporting date 12/24/05 Received 11/16/05

Through interview and a review of 51 student records, the monitoring team found the district staff did not consistently include functional information in the evaluation process by gathering, analyzing and developing a written summary of strength and needs for each skill areas affected by the student's disability, including transition. The student's present levels of academic performance, development of annual goals and short term instructional objectives therefore did not link to evaluation. Functional assessment information is available through a variety of sources in the district; however, there is not an established process across all grade levels and disciplines for collecting, analyzing, summarizing or integrating the information into the multidisciplinary assessment team report (MDAT) for all eligible students.

Desired Outcome(s): Through systemic change, the district/agency will achieve these results for students with disabilities and their families.

The district ensures comprehensive evaluations are conducted by a team of knowledgeable staff, which includes parent input.

Measurable Goal: The district/agency determines what goals are appropriate given the areas of difficulty. There must be a direct relationship between the goal(s) and the needs identified in the present levels. **(Multiple goals may be identified for each principle. Please complete a new sheet for each goal.)**

Initial and reevaluations will include functional assessments in all areas of suspected disability, which will directly link to each student's present levels of educational performance. and a written report/summary of functional assessment results will be included in the MDAT report. Functional assessment results will directly link to each student's present levels of educational performance.

Short Term Objectives: Include the specific measurable results that will be accomplished and the criteria that will be used to measure the results.

Timeline for Completion

Person(s) Responsible

6 month progress
Record date objective is met

12 month progress
Record date objective is met

1. What will the district do to improve?
 The district will explore and identify a menu of possible functional assessment tools to be used by department within RCAS.

What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective?
 The district will provide the department "menus" of functional assessment tools to SEP.

November 1, 2004

Special education advisory panel

Met January 05

Please explain the data (6 month)

An evaluation training packet was completed by Elaine Reed, RCAS psychologist, and this is used to train all new special educators within RCAS in September. The training with new staff was held on September 27, 2004. All elementary Learning Center special educators were given the state generated, "Functional Assessment for Special Education", (2/5/02), which includes a menu of possible functional assessment tools for their use. Other departments, such as OT, and PT have developed checklists/tools for their use when conducting functional assessment. All of these documents have been included with this submission.

6 month reporting date 11/24/04 X
 12 month reporting date 05/24/05 x
 18 month reporting date 12/24/05 Received 11/16/05

<p>2. What will the district do to improve? Training will be provided by program specialists and district psychologists during monthly meetings and pre-referrals regarding functional assessment tools to use and documentation methods.</p> <p>What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective? Dates of the training and persons attending will be provided to SEP.</p>	Ongoing	District psychologists and program specialists	Met January 05	
<p>Please explain the data (6 month)</p> <p>Training of current elementary Learning Center special educators occurred on September 20, 2004. Seventeen Learning Center special educators attended this meeting. Training of new special education staff over evaluation procedures was held on September 27, 2004. Twelve new special educators attended this meeting. Training of MH teachers occurred on October 4, 2004, and included 14 teachers. Training of all MS/HS special education teachers occurred on September 28, 2004, and included 57 teachers. The secondary teachers were trained on the Enderle-Severson transition assessment at this meeting, which is very functional in the area of transition. Training of ED teachers occurred on October 4, 2004, and 11 attended, and October 25, 2004, and 15 attended. Training of preschool teachers occurred on September 20, 2004 and 8 attended.</p> <p>Training also occurs during pre-referrals by RCAS psychologists, and during monthly meetings conducted with each special educator by the program specialists.</p> <p>Documentation of attendance at the official meetings has been included with this submission.</p>				
<p>3. What will the district do to improve? The district special education staff will document functional assessment results on the district MDAT, and in the student's PLOP.</p> <p>What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective? 20% of student files that are initial evaluations and/or reevaluations will be checked for functional assessment documentation in the special education file, recorded on the MDAT, and also described in the student's PLOP. The total number of files checked and the number which contain functional assessment and functional assessment reports which link to present levels of performance and annual goals, will be reported to SEP.</p>	Ongoing	Review team comprised of: Judy Osburn, Todd Christensen, one psychologist, and one specialist	Met January 05	
<p>Please explain the data (6 month)</p> <p>There were 59 students initially evaluated in RCAS so far this fall. Of that 59, <u>12</u> student files were reviewed, and <u>9</u> student files contained functional assessment and functional assessment reports which link to present levels of performance and annual goals. (75%)</p> <p>There were 156 students reevaluated in RCAS so far this fall. Of that 156, <u>31</u> student files were reviewed, and <u>28</u> student files contained functional assessment and functional assessment reports which link to present levels of performance and annual goals. (90%)</p>				

6 month reporting date 11/24/04 X
 12 month reporting date 05/24/05 x
 18 month reporting date 12/24/05 Received 11/16/05

Principle: 3 – Appropriate Evaluation				
<p>Present levels: (Statement of present levels of performance that resulted in area of non-compliance)</p> <p><u>24:05:25:04. Evaluation procedures.</u> The school districts shall ensure the child is assessed in all areas related to the suspected disability, including, as applicable, health, vision, hearing, social and emotional status, general intelligence, academic performance, communicative status, and motor abilities.</p> <p><u>24:05:25:04.03. Determination of eligibility.</u> Upon completing the administration of tests and other evaluation materials, the individual education program team shall determine whether the student is a student with a disability. The school district shall provide a copy of the evaluation report and the documentation of determination of eligibility to the parent.</p> <p>The monitoring team noted approximately 32 files that contained a variety of evaluation issues. For example, the evaluation report (MDAT) of a visually impaired student did not include achievement information for the determination of eligibility. The program of a student with learning disabilities contained goals for written expression however, written expression was never evaluated. The evaluation data for a student identified as other health impaired (OHI), supported a disability category of learning disabled and not OHI. Transition evaluations were not administered for several students of transition age. Behavior concerns were documented in MDAT reports and IEPs with no evidence of evaluation or intent to evaluate. Areas of evaluation listed on the prior notice/consent were not administered and tests were also administered when prior notice/consent was not acquired.</p>				
<p>Desired Outcome(s): Through systemic change, the district/agency will achieve these results for students with disabilities and their families.</p> <p>The district ensures the evaluation or reevaluation procedures and instruments meet the minimum requirements.</p>				
<p>Measurable Goal: The district/agency determines what goals are appropriate given the areas of difficulty. There must be a direct relationship between the goal(s) and the needs identified in the present levels. (Multiple goals may be identified for each principle. Please complete a new sheet for each goal.)</p> <p>Students will be assessed in all areas of suspected disability to ensure proper identification of students with disabilities, and to design educational programming to meet individual student needs.</p>				
Short Term Objectives: Include the specific measurable results that will be accomplished and the criteria that will be used to measure the results.	Timeline for Completion	Person(s) Responsible	6 month progress Record date objective is met	12 month progress Record date objective is met

6 month reporting date 11/24/04 X
 12 month reporting date 05/24/05 x
 18 month reporting date 12/24/05 Received 11/16/05

<p>1. What will the district do to improve?</p> <p>The assessment team will meet during pre-referral regarding each student that is to receive an initial evaluation and/or reevaluation. During this meeting, the team will review existing data, including any outside evaluations and/or diagnoses to determine areas to evaluate. An evaluation plan will be designed based upon this review.</p> <p>What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective?</p> <p>10% of student files that are initial evaluations and/or reevaluations will be checked by the review team to assure that the students were assessed in all areas of suspected disability. The total number of files reviewed and the number which contain evaluation in all areas of suspected disability will be forwarded to SEP.</p>	Ongoing	<p>District psychologists and case managers</p> <p>Review team comprised of: Judy Osburn, Todd Christensen, one psychologist, and one specialist</p>	Met January 05	
<p>Please explain the data (6 month)</p> <p>There were 59 students initially evaluated in RCAS so far this fall. Of that 59, <u>11</u> student files were reviewed, and <u>10</u> student files contained assessments in all areas of suspected disability. (91%) There were 156 students reevaluated in RCAS so far this fall. Of that 156, <u>29</u> student files were reviewed, and <u>24</u> student files contained assessments in all areas of suspected disability. (83%)</p>				

Principle: 5 – Individual Education Program

Present levels: (Statement of present levels of performance that resulted in area of non-compliance)

24:05:27:13.02. Transition services

Transition services are a coordinated set of activities for a student, designed within an outcome-oriented process.

24:05:27:01.03. Content of individualized education program

For each student beginning at age 16 or younger, the IEP is to include a statement of the needed transition services, including interagency responsibilities. Beginning at least one year before a student reaches the age of majority under state law, the student's individualized education program must include a statement that the student has been informed of his or her rights under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, if any, that will transfer to the student on reaching the age of majority.

The course of study for each student is a compilation of the required courses to graduate from high school. Based on the student's interests and individual evaluation, specific courses that are linked to the student's life planning outcomes should be discussed by the IEP team and incorporated into the IEP. Through an analysis of the individual transition evaluation, the IEP team develops present levels of performance, transition services and activities which link to the student's life planning outcomes.

Through a review of student records and interviews with district staff, the monitoring team found the district lacks a system to ensure a consistent

6 month reporting date 11/24/04 X

12 month reporting date 05/24/05 x

18 month reporting date 12/24/05 Received 11/16/05

transition planning process for students with disabilities. Inconsistencies which were found included the lack of transition evaluation for several students and life planning outcomes not developed or specific to the students' interests for nine students. The present levels of performance for transition were not developed or contained very little information. The course of study was not developed for six students by age 14 and did not link to the life planning outcomes. Transition services and activities were not addressed for six students by age 16. The transfer of rights was not completed one year prior to age 18 for two students. The specific graduation requirements were not addressed in the IEPs of 11 students. The district showed evidence of all components required in the transition planning process for students, however, they did not link to present levels of performance and evaluation and were not consistently reflected in the IEP process.

Desired Outcome(s): Through systemic change, the district/agency will achieve these results for students with disabilities and their families.

The district ensures transition plans for students are a coordinated set of activities, reflecting student strengths and interests, to prepare them for post school activities.

Measurable Goal: The district/agency determines what goals are appropriate given the areas of difficulty. There must be a direct relationship between the goal(s) and the needs identified in the present levels. **(Multiple goals may be identified for each principle. Please complete a new sheet for each goal.)**

For all students of transition age, an outcome oriented process will be developed which will include evaluation, life planning outcomes, specific course of study, service recommendations and educational goals.

Short Term Objectives: Include the specific measurable results that will be accomplished and the criteria that will be used to measure the results.	Timeline for Completion	Person(s) Responsible	6 month progress Record date objective is met	12 month progress Record date objective is met
1. What will the district do to improve? A core group of staff will be trained on the Transition Requirements Checklist instrument, and transition process and procedures. What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective? Verification of training date, presenter, and participants will be submitted to SEP.	October 1, 2004	Judy Osburn, Program Specialists and TLSP	Met January 05	

6 month reporting date 11/24/04 X
 12 month reporting date 05/24/05 x
 18 month reporting date 12/24/05 Received 11/16/05

Please explain the data (6 month) Ed O’Leary trained a core group of staff on the Transition Requirements Checklist instrument on October 27-28, 2004. Staff from Central and Dakota attended on October 27, and staff from Stevens and West attended on October 28, 2004. The following staff attended this training: October 27—Noel Sayles, Danny Mitchelson, Yvette DeSanctis, Kathy Yirka, Teri Georgas, Margie Morrison, Barb LaBarge, Kerry Ruth, Meredith Beug, Julie Newstrom and Tom Brey October 28—Anita Winter, Sally Webb, Peggy Bias, Diane Bates, Kim Anderson, Eileen Craig, Loretta Beringer, and Robin Cline Training of all MS/HS special education teachers occurred on September 28, 2004, and included 57 teachers. The secondary teachers were trained on the Enderle-Severson transition assessment at this meeting, which is a good example of functional assessment in the area of transition. It was decided by the all MS/HS special education teachers would at the very least, use the Enderle-Severson, as a component of their transition assessment to better aid in transition planning.				
2. What will the district do to improve? The core group of trained personnel will conduct reviews of IEPs of students 14 years of age and older on all transition requirements, then compile, analyze, and summarize the findings. What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective? The summary of baseline data regarding transition requirements will be submitted to SEP.	November 15, 2004	Judy Osburn, Program Specialists and TLSP	Met January 05	
Please explain the data (6 month) 108 student files for students of transition age were reviewed on October 27-28, 2004. The summary of baseline data is included with this submission.				
3. What will the district do to improve? A “report-out” meeting will be held with all special educators that write transition IEPs to report findings, develop strategies/interventions, set target goals and timelines for implementation. What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective? Verification of this meeting, including all participants, and notes regarding the decisions made, will be sent to SEP.	January 31, 2005	Judy Osburn, Program Specialists and TLSP and middle school and high school special educators		Not Met May 25, 2005 Goal Met 11/16/05
Please explain the data (6 month) The “report out” meeting has not been scheduled as of 11/18/04. The baseline data is just “hot off the press” as of today’s date.				

6 month reporting date 11/24/04 X
 12 month reporting date 05/24/05 x
 18 month reporting date 12/24/05 Received 11/16/05

Please explain the data (12 month)				
Staff was given all data from original TOPs training and goals were set at a meeting on March 14, 2005. Thirty-eight MS and HS staff attended this meeting. The transition forms within the IEP were changed to better reflect the TOPS process, and a copy is enclosed, as well as the Technical Assistance booklet that goes with the new transition pages.				
4. What will the district do to improve? Formal follow up reviews of IEPs will be conducted by review team members to determine improvement and proximity in meeting target goals. What data will be given to SEP to verify this objective? The total number of IEPs reviewed and the number which meet transition content requirements will be submitted to SEP	April 15, 2005	Judy Osburn, Program Specialists and TLSP		Not Met May 25, 2005 Met 11/16/05
Please explain the data (6 month)				
The follow-up reviews will be scheduled in the spring of 2005.				
A group of secondary teachers will review a sampling of transition IEPs on 11/7/05. The transition pages were just recently changed and the TA provided. It will be Fall before we have a good sample to check.				
Please explain the data (18 month)				
A group of secondary teachers reviewed a sampling of transition IEPs on 11/16/05. Twenty-one secondary IEP transition plans were reviewed and the data is enclosed. This data includes both the baseline TOPS data and the recent data.				